

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,130	03/16/2004	Georg Eggers	QIM 2003 P 50205 US	9233
68038 SLATER & M.	7590 10/09/200°	,	EXAMINER RAHMAN, FAHMIDA	
17950 PRESTO	-			
SUITE 1000 DALLAS, TX	75252		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
,			2116	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/801,130	EGGERS ET AL.	
Office A	Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Fahmida Rahman	2116	
The MAILIN Period for Reply	G DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHICHEVER IS LC - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS f - If NO period for reply is - Failure to reply within th Any reply received by th	TATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL ONGER, FROM THE MAILING D be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 rom the mailing date of this communication, specified above, the maximum statutory period e set or extended period for reply will, by statute e Office later than three months after the mailin stment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO (36(a): In no event, however, may a reply be ting will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDON)	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				,
1) Responsive	to communication(s) filed on <u>20 J</u>	<u>uly 2007</u> .		•
2a) This action is	s <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.		
3)☐ Since this ap	plication is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is	
closed in acc	cordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims	<b>;</b>			
4a) Of the ab 5)		wn from consideration.		
Application Papers				
10)☐ The drawing(	tion is objected to by the Examines) filed on is/are: a) according a request that any objection to the	epted or b) objected to by the		
	drawing sheet(s) including the correct eclaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgn a)⊠ All b)□ 3 1.⊠ Certific 2.□ Certific 3.□ Copies	nent is made of a claim for foreign Some * c) None of: ed copies of the priority document of the copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document of the linternational Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
<sup>*</sup> See the attach	ed detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receiv	red.	
		•		
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References     Notice of Draftspersor	n's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) e Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	

Application/Control Number: 10/801,130 Page 2

Art Unit: 2116

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed on 7/20/2007.

2. Claims 1-16 have been amended, claims 17-19 have been added, no claims have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-19 are pending.

## Claim Objections

Claim objected to because of the following informalities:

"A system" recited in claim 9 should be "The system" as system is recited earlier.

"at least one receiving device" in lines 1-2 of claim 12 and claim 13 should be

"the at least one receiving device" as it is recited in line 4 of claim 1.

"at least one receiving device" in line 5 and line 14 of claim 16 should be "the at least one receiving device" as it is recited in line 4.

"at one" in line 6 of claim 16 should be changed to "at least one".

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Harvey (US Patent 5734285).

For claim 1, Harvey teaches the following limitations:

A system, comprising: a signal generator (150 in Fig 38) coupled to an input of a signal line (52), the signal generator generating a signal (CKD) of a particular frequency (CKD is the driver clock signal mentioned in line 20 of column 16. Therefore, it has a particular frequency); at least one receiving device (148 and 142) electrically coupled to an output of the signal line (148 is coupled to 52), wherein the at least one receiving device comprises a clock generator (148 comprises divide by N counter, which divides clock CKR to produce another clock LF as mentioned in lines 65-67 of column 15. Therefore, 148 can be considered as a clock generator) wherein the clock generator is synchronized to the signal (LF is synchronized to CKD as it is generated from CKR, which is generated from CKD) and generates a clock signal (LF is a clock signal, whose frequency is CKR/N), wherein the clock signal comprises a frequency less than a frequency of the signal of a particular frequency (LF's frequency is less than the frequency of CKD, since CKD may have same frequency as CKR as mentioned in lines 25-30 of column 16); and an impedance element (58) coupled to the input of the signal line (52), the impedance element comprising an impedance chosen to create a resonant condition at the input of the signal line (58 is a resonating circuitry), wherein the resonant condition comprises a resonant frequency that

essentially coincides with the frequency of the signal (frequency of CKR is essentially same as frequency of CKD).

For claim 2, Fig 31 shows that CKR is sinusoid. As CKD may be same clock as CKR, CKD is also sinusoid. Lines 50-60 of column 8 mention that the CKR is sinusoid when only inductive component is used.

For claim 3, 150 is a driver.

For claim 4, Fig 33 shows CKD can be almost rectangular.

For claims 6 and 7, 62 shows an implementation of resonator comprising inductive and capacitive components.

For claim 11, counter is a semiconductor component.

For claim 12, the signal is used for generating clock, which is further used to coordinate data transfer in 14.

For claim 13, VC is the further signal. This signal is used to generate CKR, which is used to co-ordinate data transfer in 14.

For claim 14, VC represents the frequency difference and therefore, has lower frequency than CKD/CKR.

For claim 15, 140 is a PLL (lines 63-66 of column 15). Therefore, 142, 148 are part of PLL. Therefore, they can be considered as PLL circuit.

For claim 16, Harvey teaches the following limitations:

A process for generating a synchronizer, the process comprising:

- transmitting signal (CKD) from a signal generator device (150) to at least one receiving device (148 and 142) in an electronic system (Fig 38);
- coupling at least one additional device (58) at an output of the signal generator, the at one additional device comprising an impedance such that a resonant oscillatory condition is created at an output of the signal generator (58 is a resonating circuit with inductance/capacitance to create a resonance in 146);
- adjusting a center frequency of the resonant oscillatory condition (CKR is adjusted to produce resonance), wherein the center frequency modified to essentially coincide with a frequency of the signal (depending on the circuit component CKD and CKR can be same);
- generating a clock signal (LF) synchronized to the signal (LF is produced from CKD. Thus it is synchronized to the signal), wherein a frequency of

the clock signal is less than the frequency of the signal, wherein the clock signal is generated by at least one receiving device (LF has lower frequency than CKD/CKR. LF is produced by 148).

For claim 17, Fig 14 shows the switches coupled to the resonating circuit to on/off the device.

For claim 18, capacitors are implemented with capacitive diode (lines 20-21 of column 17).

For claim 19, Fig 13 shows a design where two devices are in parallel.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 5, 8, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey (US Patent 5734285).

For claim 5, the discussion related to Fig 38 does not mention about filtering the rectangular signal to produce a sinusoid signal. However, Fig 15 shows the

waveform of P1 as rectangular, which is output of 66, the part of driver. If the resonating section only comprises inductor, then the output waveform is sinusoid. Therefore, the design can include a filter in resonating section to produce a sinusoid from a rectangular signal.

For claim 8, Harvey do not explicitly mention that capacitance is set during manufacture. Examiner takes an official notice that setting capacitance during manufacture is well known in the art. One ordinary skill would be motivated to set it depending on the design choice.

For claim 9, line 4 of column 9 mentions that inductor is variably adjusted.

For claim 10, note lines 20-21 of column 17.

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fahmida Rahman whose telephone number is 571-272-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571-272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fahmida Rahman Examiner Art Unit 2116

\*\*\*

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER